

REMARKS

Claims 46-49, 51, 54-58, 61, 70-73 and 76-78 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 46-49, 51, 55-58, 70-73 and 77-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,832,242 to Keskar et al. in view of “Synchronization Profile,” Bluetooth Specification Version 1.1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Keskar does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Keskar is directed towards enabling sharing based on relevance scores. See e.g., Abstract. While a user may indicate a wish to share a relevant item, the information that is transferred in the intent to share is not information regarding the item. An intent to share is no more than indicating an intent to share a “relevant item.” This intent does not describe the item. Once the recipient’s HSA determines that an intent to send an item exists, a look up to a database is made to determine if the sender has similar interests to the recipient. This is not summary information of the actual file, this information is part of a grander scheme to share unknown files based on interest profiles and relevance scores. See e.g., Figure 7 and col. 13, lines 20 – 54. Furthermore, in Keskar, a first user does not demark files to transfer, but rather indicates items which are sharable. In other words, the first user is directing the file to no one user in particular. Adding a Bluetooth specification to Keskar does cure these deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 54, 61, and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keskar and Bluetooth and further in view of Rodgers (US 20020065732). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As argued above, Keskar-Bluetooth does not teach or suggest the present claims. Rodgers does not cure the combinations deficiencies as argued in the Applicants’ previous response to office action. The present invention as claimed is directed towards one user informing another user of the executable files available on the first user’s portable computer system to be downloaded to the second user’s portable computer system. Rodgers’ disclosure is

limited to the transfer of information from a PDA to a desktop computer, not from a portable computer to another portable computer as claimed. Rodgers requires docking the PDA with the desktop to reconcile license data between the systems. This teaches away from transferring demarked files between two portable devices. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

All rejections have been addressed. In the event there are still outstanding issues, the undersigned requests the examiner to resolve them by telephone in order to expedite allowance of this application. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: October 25, 2010

By: /shawn diedtrich /
Shawn Diedtrich
Registration No. 58,176
Direct: 480.704.4615

9229 Sunset Blvd., Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860